REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 26, 2007. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, and 14 are in independent form. Claims 1, 5-10, and 14 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although it is not conceded that the rejection is correct or valid, Claims 1, 10, and 14 have been amended to more clearly recite a useful, concrete, and tangible result in an effort to expedite the allowance of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0002677 (*Eade et al.*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 10, and 14, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a method for facilitating changes to security systems. The method includes detecting a back-end security update in a back-end database. Non-conforming information between the back-end database and a front-end database that stores front-end security information is determined. An update command for reconstructing the back-end database to conform

to the front-end database is generated and stored in the back-end database and/or the front-end database. The update command is executed.

Notable features of Claim 1 are "generating an update command for reconstructing said back-end database to conform to said front-end database and storing said update command in at least one of said back-end database and said front-end database; and executing said update command." By virtue of these features, a security manager can maintain a front-end database that includes Enterprise Security System (ESS) information, which is easier to use and understand than Remote Access Control Facility (RACF) updates, and can easily reconstruct a back-end database that includes RACF updates using the update command, for example.[1]

Eade et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a system and method for controlling access to system resources. Apparently, *Eade et al.* teaches a data processing system that includes a queue manager and security switches that control a degree of access afforded to the queue manager to access system resources of the data processing system. (*See* paragraph 33.) Security is provided within the data processing system via a RACF application and a MQSeries security component resource manager. (*See* paragraph 34.) The MQSeries security component resource manager accesses the RACF application and RACF profiles, and generates MQSeries Refresh Security Commands to set the status of the security switches. (*See* paragraph 36.) Queue sharing group profiles are used to set security settings at a group level for all queue managers within a group, and queue manager profiles are used to set security checks that are

[1] The example(s) presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes only. Any details presented in the illustrative example(s) should not be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

effective at a queue manager level and to override an effect of queue sharing group level profiles on a given queue manager. (*See* paragraph 64.)

Eade et al. fails to explicitly disclose a database, however, FIG. 2 suggests that RACF group level profiles and RACF queue manager profiles are stored in a single database. Nothing has been found in *Eade et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest a "generating an update command for reconstructing said back-end database to conform to said front-end database and storing said update command in at least one of said back-end database and said front-end database; and executing said update command," as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Eade et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claims 10 and 14 include features similar to those discussed above, in which an update command for reconstructing the back-end database to conform to the front-end database is generated and executed. Therefore, Claims 10 and 14 also are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Response. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Response timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the

Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the allowance of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2056741_1